DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 752 TM 014 838

AUTHOR Matter, M. Kevin; And Others
TITLE Relevant Writing Assessment: Instructionally-Sound Alternative Testing.
INSTITUTION Cherry Creek School District 5, Englewood, Colo.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Constructed Response; Educational Assessment; *Essay Tests; Evaluation Methods; *Grade 10; High Schools; *High School Students; *Language Arts; School Districts; *Scoring; Test Construction; Writing Achievement; Writing Evaluation; *Writing Tests
IDENTIFIERS Cherry Creek Schools CO; Curriculum Based Assessment

ABSTRACT

The writing assessment used in grade 10 of the Cherry Creek, (Colorado) schools is described. Over the past 3 years, the focus of the assessment has changed from an assessment heavily weighted on multiple-choice items, with minimal constructed response tasks, to an assessment based entirely on a written product. Students are provided with multiple sessions to draft, revise, and edit; they must then compose a final copy of an essay. In this way, the level of performance reflects a real-life situation, in which one has a chance to revise work with less time constraints than are present in conventional writing assessments that force a student to complete an essay in one sitting. The grade 10 language arts assessment is a year-long process, with the following components: (1) development or redevelopment of the scoring guide; (2) selection of the scoring team; (2) selection of topics; (4) the student writing process; (5) research and evaluation by the staff; (6) training of scorers; (7) scoring of papers; (8) feedback to students; and (9) feedback from scorers to educators. Attachments include scoring guides, the assessment booklet, and other information related to scoring. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. KEVIN MATTER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Relevant Writing Assessment: Instructionally-Sound Alternative Testing

M. Kevin Matter
Coordinator, Testing and Research
Office of Research and Evaluation

Ray Bruhse
Research and Evaluation Specialist II
Office of Research and Evaluation

Ron Marostica
Language Arts Specialist
Teacher on Special Assignment

Cherry Creek Schools
4700 S. Yosemite Street
Englewood, Colorado 80111
(303) 773-1184

Paper presented at the 1988 Curriculum Assessment

Site-based management (decentralization) is espoused as a means to improve public schools through increased autonomy and decreased bureaucracy. While it promises positive impacts upon instruction, ensuring effective and efficient instruction in a site-based setting may require nontraditional testing methods. More comprehensive and alternative assessments are needed to determine the effects of a multitude of differing instructional techniques, textbooks, etc., than is possible through traditional, multiple-choice, norm-referenced achievement tests.

Cherry Creek Schools (Arapahoe SD #5), a suburban district of 28,000 students, has a relatively long history of site-based management, in philosophy, practice, and structure. It has districtwide objectives in several curricular areas (e.g., language arts, mathematics, social studies, science), but the instructional materials, processes, and methods used to meet those objectives are determined at the school (and in many cases, individual teacher) level. While the district is still considered by many to be composed totally of middle to upper income families, there is much diversity in the district, as evidenced by the growing number of schools and families eligible for Chapter 1 assistance and free- or reduced-priced meals. (For example, the three high schools have quite different student populations in terms of family income, mobility, and ethnicity.)

Cherry Creek has used locally developed language arts assessments at grades 3, 6, 8, and 10 since the mid-1970's. The assessments had both a multiple-choice component and a constructed response (direct writing) portion. While the committees which developed those assessments worked independently, we did attempt to have a continuum of skills assessed in the progression from grades 3-to-6-to-8-to-10.

Over the past three years the focus of the grade 10 assessment, the subject of this paper, has changed dramatically, from an assessment heavily weighted (in time and importance) on multiple choice items, with minimal constructed response tasks, to an assessment based entirely on a written product. The multiple-choice portion measured some objectives more completely than possible on a standardized, norm-referenced test, but there was much overlap/duplication in objectives. The constructed response (directed writing) portion at all grades assessed was a performance assessment, but scoring focused on isolated skills. We looked at skills such as spelling words, writing sentences (simple, compound, complex, compound-complex), writing paragraphs, taking notes, outlining an article, and writing an essay, but we tested them as individual, isolated skills, using separate activities.

Philosophy

Since skills are neither taught nor learned in isolation, the grade 10 assessment was modified in 1987-88 to include a more comprehensive writing sample, which paralleled actual instructional methods. We eliminated the multiple tasks in the constructed response portion of the assessment and expanded the essay portion to a more realistic, authentic activity for the students. That is, students were provided with multiple sessions in which to draft, revise/edit, and compose a final copy of an essay. Needing to complete an essay in one sitting is not the preferred method of assessing writing process, as it constricts significant pieces of that process.

Most individuals in a work setting have an opportunity to draft/revise/edit/receive comments, before preparing a final version of anything written for someone other than the author. At least most of us want an opportunity to use a writing process to produce writing which effectively and accurately communicates our thoughts. Yet, many assessments still force students into a situation with time or process constraints which are rarely present in "real life." We force students to fit the assessment, instead of creating assessments which allow students an opportunity to produce an example of their knowledge, creativity, ability--of their best work. We then, incorrectly many times, assume that the level of performance exhibited in that test situation applies in these "real life" situations, or that those are their "true" levels of performance.

The 1988-89 assessment process was based on the following ideas:

* Any properly implemented assessment should impact the curriculum, teacher instruction, and student affect.

* The writing sample scoring process should be more than just a means of determining a "score" for students; it should impact teacher knowledge/techniques and the curriculum.

* Student results are not as important as the **process** of determining the scores and discovering the underlying reasons for the results.

* The goal of assessment is not to discover who is doing things "right" and then making others do the same, but to bring agreement as to what **are** the essentials of good writing, and allowing building autonomy concerning methods to achieve adequate and acceptable results.

* Assessment techniques should parallel effective instructional techniques as closely as possible.

In 1989-90 we eliminated the multiple-choice portion of the assessment, feeling that the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP) at grade 10 would provide sufficient information about performance on support skills. Neither the TAP nor the multiple-choice portion of the assessment, however, provide teachers with instructionally sensitive or relevant information about the reading/writing **process**, that is, about becoming literate, which is the goal of the language arts curriculum.

The Grade 10 Language Arts Assessment

The grade 10 language arts assessment is a yearlong process, including the following major components.

* Development/Refinement of the Scoring Guide: A team of teachers developed the scoring criteria after a thorough review of existing analytic and holistic rubrics. The 1987-88 and 1988-89 scoring guide addressed both content and mechanics, using a 1-9 (low-high) scale. [The 1989-90 scoring guide is a 4-point scale addressing four major areas, modified to parallel rubrics currently used in other district writing assessments.] Copies of the scoring guide were provided to teachers and students early in the school year, so it could be used throughout the year with writing assignments, not just for the assessment. (See Attachment 1, Scoring Guide for the 1988-89 Expository Writing Portion.)

* Selection of the Scoring Team: Approximately 75% of the members (grade 10 Language Arts teachers, five from each school) are retained from one year to the next, to provide both consistency and opportunity for "new blood."

* Selection of Topics: The writing "prompts" are revised if necessary, but some are used each year. Since the process is just as important as the product, having new topics each year is less necessary. (One component of "authentic" assessment is that the questions or tasks are not secret, but known.) For several years students were asked to select one topic from several choices, with the scoring criteria the same regardless of the topic. For the 1989-90 assessment, several topics were pilot tested in the fall using grade 11 students, with a single topic selected for use in spring. (See Attachment 2, 1988-89 prompts, Constructed Response booklet.)

* Student Writing Process: The assessment writing process that students used to create the piece of writing replicated the writing process (i.e., prewriting, revision, final copy). During the first day each student received a prewriting booklet containing the directions and topics for the essay. The prewriting or planning process can include drafting, brainstorming, outlining, developing a thesis statement, etc. Throughout the process, students were free to use a dictionary or thesaurus, but their teacher could not provide assistance to them with their writing process. The second day students received their prewriting booklets and their final copy booklet. They were encouraged to revise and edit their prewriting efforts before writing their final version. Students who had time left after they finished their final copy were instructed to check over their work.

* Research and Evaluation Staff Tasks: Extensive planning was done prior to the scoring process. Scoring this type of assessment required more planning than for multiple-choice tests. As shown in Attachment 3 (Process and Procedures for LA10 Constructed Response Scoring, 1988-89) the Research and Evaluation staff had numerous tasks. Although many of these can be accomplished and planned for prior to scoring, changes are often necessary during the scoring process. As a result, flexibility must be incorporated into this whole process.

  A major task was to determine a schedule for scoring, both the number of sessions overall and per day, given the number of scorers and papers to score. We determined our schedule using the following: 15 papers per packet, a scoring time of 40 minutes per packet, and a 5 minute break between sessions.

  Another consideration was how to reduce scorer bias. We stamped a sequential number on the cover page (containing student identifying information) of the constructed response booklet and on the first page of the essay. Packets were prepared using a proportional number of papers from each school. The cover page was removed before scoring and reattached once scoring was completed.

* Training of Scorers: The initial training of the scorers on using the rubric wad done through group scoring of actual student papers. These benchmark papers were selected to reflect each of the nine levels of the scoring guide. During training, which took about three hours, a consensus was reached by the group on the "correct" score for each paper, with sufficient discussion so each scorer understood why that score was appropriate for that paper. The training was essential in gaining a consistent definition of "many," "few," "some," "good," and "weak," as used in the 1988-89 grade 10 scoring guide. Periodic recalibration of scorers was done throughout the scoring process, using additional "real" papers. Periodic feedback provided scorers with an individual picture of how they were applying the scoring guide to the papers. (See Attachment 4 for information provided to scorers and forms used to summarize scorer responses.)

* Scoring of Papers: Two different scorers read each paper, with the second scorer unaware of the first score. Scorers were paired for the entire scoring process. For example, scorer A would always be the second reader for the packets read first by scorer E; likewise scorer K would always be the second scorer for the packets read first by scorer A. (See Attachment 5, 1988-89 Grade 10 Language Arts Constructed Response Scoring Schedule.) A third scorer read the paper if the two scores were discrepant by more than 2-points (e.g., 4 vs. 7). (See Attachment 6 for a sample of a Constructed Response Scoring Summary, with discrepancies marked which resulted in a third scoring.)

* Student Feedback: The papers were returned to the students, with the scores given by both readers noted on the cover page.

* Curricular/Instructional Feedback: The scoring team summarized their impressions of the papers based upon the scoring guide, suggesting areas of emphasis for next year, curricular changes, etc. which need to be addressed.

Impressions and Results

Both product and process results from the past two years are important.

* Effective and efficient assessment of direct writing samples is a complex and complicated task, not to be entered into quickly or without extensive planning. Adequate scoring and materials-handling space and an adequate number of scorers and personnel are necessary. Identify substitute scorers as replacements on the scoring team for scorer absenteeism (illness, jury duty, sick children, etc.). Adequate personnel must be available to create packets, record the first score, record the second score, determine/pull papers needing third score resolution--that is, keep the whole process moving.

* Scoring writing samples is expensive, particularly in-house. However, the benefits of having district language arts teachers score the papers (i.e., increased knowledge about the writing process, meeting of the minds on what constitutes effective writing, etc.) outweigh the costs (i.e., substitute teachers pay, loss of stability of regular teacher in the classroom, etc.).

* Assessment influences teaching; teachers teach what and how students will be assessed. Thus, to achieve instructional changes in strategies/methods used by teachers, the assessment process should incorporate those effective techniques in the testing process.

* Students take assessment seriously when they see a relationship between assessment procedures and their teacher's instructional strategies.

* Scorers can reliably score papers written on a variety of topics utilizing a single scoring guide. Further study is needed to ensure that topic choice does not bias scoring.

* Even though the scoring process is hectic, take time to note ideas for changes and keep a record of each step in the process. Do not depend on remembering what was done and how for next year--you will forget all of those great ideas which might make the system work better.

* The current assessment process reduced the level of competition among the schools, bringing more cohesion and cooperation to the grade 10 writing program.

* It is essential to recognize the importance of human needs in the scoring process, and ensure a comfortable scoring environment. To keep on task and refreshed, the scorers need adequate work space, moderate room temperature and ventilation, rest breaks, lunch breaks, snacks, comfortable chairs, etc.

* Of 1765 papers scored in 1988-89, 12.53% required a third reading, either because of a large split between the scorings or a pass/fail split. (In 1987-88 15.17% of the papers needed three readings.) Papers which were written off-topic automatically failed (61 = 3.5%). Only 19 students (1.1%) wrote on an acceptable topic but produced an unacceptable/failing essay (defined as a '0' score).

Educational Importance

One reason mentioned for not attempting alternative methods of assessment is their complexity and time-consuming nature. As mentioned above (see Attachment 3), the tasks required for scoring the grade 10 writing sample are numerous. A complete system of "authentic" assessments, covering various language arts tasks (reading, listening, writing) as well as mathematics, science, social studies, and other curricular areas, in grade 10 and other grades, would require much more commitment in money, personnel, and other resources than most districts are willing to make.

However, the commitment to alternative assessments appears to be increasing as the nontraditional assessment methods used for language arts are being examined for applications in other curricular areas. In addition, replicating sound instructional procedures legitimizes the assessment for teachers much more than a traditional multiple-choice test.

The instructional impact of this type of assessment appears to be significant, at least as evidenced by not only our grade 10 assessment, but our grade 8 assessment (a two-week assessment unit using a "real" piece of literature) and our pilot West Area Writing Project (a grade 1-11 assessment utilizing the same scoring guide for each grade and scoring all grades at the same time).

The direct and indirect implementation costs involved in this type of assessment cannot be ignored, however. Commitment and active involvement from various groups are needed for smooth, successful, and effective assessment. These needs include the following major areas.

* Teacher involvement in the development process, which may require increased substitute teacher costs.
* Staff development for teachers and administrators to implement the conclusions/recommendations of the assessment.
* Teacher, principal, and central office administrator commitment to score authentic assessments, with adequate training time, scoring time, and debriefing time. The most important part of these assessments is the staff development/training/learning which is a part of the training/scoring process.

* Commitment and belief by central office administrators and school board members that alternative assessments will provide greater instructional improvement than that generated by the results of norm-referenced, multiple-choice, standardized tests.

* Commitment from the Research and Evaluation, curriculum development, and data processing offices to devote adequate time to develop procedures, methods, and systems necessary to implement authentic assessments.

* Adequate Research and Evaluation staff and space during the scoring sessions to manage the flow of papers and enable the scorers to maintain a consistent, efficient scoring pace.

* Commitment and decisions on where staff time and resources will be spent relative to the dichotomy of traditional vs. alternative assessment. A decision should be made, preferably at the district level, about resource allocation, since it is difficult to promote, explain, and implement both norm-referenced and alternative assessments simultaneously.

* Effective and continuous communication among all groups involved is required for the process to flow smoothly.

List of Attachments

		Page #'s
Attachment 1	Scoring Guide for the 1988-89 Expository Writing Portion	12-13
Attachment 2	Grade 10 Language Arts Assessment Constructed Response Test Booklet	14-17
Attachment 3	Process and Procedures for LA10 Constructed Response Scoring, 1988-89	18-23
Attachment 4	Information for LA10 Scorers and Forms to Summarize Responses	24-26
Attachment 5	Grade 10 Language Arts Constructed Response Scoring Schedule, April, 1989	27
Attachment 6	Constructed Response Scoring Summary (Sample)	28

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS

ATTACHMENT 1

Grade 10 Language Arts Assessment

SCORING GUIDE FOR THE 1988-89 EXPOSITORY WRITING PORTION

Scale	Description
9-8	Student's paper has the following characteristics: * Four or more paragraphs to include introduction (with thesis statement), body, and conclusion; * Support for the thesis statement through the use of excellent examples, facts, and/or incidents; * Few errors in usage, grammar, and/or mechanics; * Varied sentence structure; * Appropriate use of transitions.
7-6	Student's paper has the following characteristics: * Four or more paragraphs to include introduction (with thesis statement), body, and conclusion; * Support for the thesis statement through the use of good examples, facts, and/or incidents; * Some errors in usage, grammar, and/or mechanics, but they do not hamper communication; * Little variety in sentence structure; * Little use of transitions.
5-4	Student's paper has the following characteristics: * Four or more paragraphs to include introduction (with thesis statement), body, and conclusion; * Attempted support for the thesis statement through acceptable examples, facts, and/or incidents; * Noticeable errors in usage, grammar, and/or mechanics, which interfere with communication; * Little or no variety in sentence structure; * Use of few or no transitions.

(over)

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS

Grade 10 Language Arts Assessment

SCORING GUIDE FOR THE 1988-89 EXPOSITORY WRITING PORTION

Scale	Description

3-2	Student's paper has the following characteristics:
	* Four or more paragraphs;
	* Two or more of these errors:
	  * Weak thesis statement;
	  * Poor support for the thesis statement;
	  * Serious and/or many errors in usage, grammar, and/or mechanics;
	  * No variety in sentence structure;
	  * Use of few or no transitions.

1	Student's paper has the following characteristics:
	* Four or more paragraphs;
	* Four or more of these errors:
	  * No thesis statement;
	  * Unacceptable support for the thesis statement;
	  * Numerous serious errors in usage, grammar, and/or mechanics;
	  * No variety in sentence structure;
	  * No transitions.

Ø	Student's paper has the following characteristics: * Fewer than four paragraphs.

(over)

ATTACHMENT 2

NAME _____

SCHOOL _____

ID NUMBER _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS

LANGUAGE ARTS ASSESSMENT

GRADE 10

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE

Today is the day to produce the final version of your essay. The three essay topics are below. Your essay must contain:

1. An introductory paragraph (more than just a thesis statement);
2. Two or more supporting paragraphs; and
3. A concluding paragraph of two or more sentences.

Make any changes you feel necessary to improve your first draft of the topic you chose. Then write the final version of your essay in the space on pages 1 through 3. You may use a dictionary or thesaurus if you wish.

1. From the literature you have studied, choose a character whose beliefs or values put him/her in conflict with the rest of society. In a well-developed essay explain how and why the character is in conflict with society.

2. Assume you have been asked to identify the three most important people, events, or inventions in history. In a well-developed essay, explain the significance of each of the choices you made. Your essay must discuss only one category; do not mix people, events, and inventions in your essay.

3. Assume that the following courses might be added as graduation requirements. Choose one (or the ones) you think should be added. In a well-developed essay, defend your choice.

   - Basic Computer Literacy
   - Sex Education
   - Parenting
   - Drug and Alcohol Abuse
   - Foreign Language

CONTINUE ON PAGE 2

USE PAGE 3 IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE

USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE IF YOU NEED MORE ROOM

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS

ATTACHMENT 3

Office of Research and Evaluation

Process and Procedures for LA10 Constructed Response Scoring 1988-89

MATERIALS

Order one month prior to scoring:

- -Envelopes for Scoring Packets (15 essays/packet)
- -Post-It Notes (Colors: Yellow Sizes: 1 1/2" x 2")
- -Pens for scoring (Colors: Red)
- -Paper clips
- -Rubber bands (Sizes:)

TASKS PRIOR TO SCORING

1. Determine the number of scorers needed.
2. Determine who will score and obtain names.
3. Assign each scorer a letter designation (A-Z).
4. Determine a sequence for scoring the packets: first scoring and second scoring.
5. Determine a scorer pattern: who will score a particular packet first, and who will score that same packet the second time.
6. Ensure that all scorers will be present each day, from training through the entire scoring process.
7. Determine if particular scorers will be designated to score essays needed a third scoring. If so, decide how many scorers will score the third readings, and who those scorers should be.
8. Revise and print Constructed Response Scoring Summary sheet.
9. Determine a schedule for scoring: How many scoring sessions/rounds overall and how many rounds/sessions per day.
10. Revise and print Grade 10 Language Arts Constructed Response Scoring Schedule.
11. Revise and print List to Ensure All Packets Are Scored Twice.

12. Determine how many minutes are needed for scoring a packet, and how many minutes the break between session/rounds should be before scoring another packet.

13. Determine the physical arrangements of the room to be used for scoring. Arrange the tables for groups of 5 scorers, with a box for SCORED packets, and a designated area for each scorer to pick up packets which need to be scored.

14. Ensure that at least two mainframe terminals are available for entering data.

PROCESS

PRIOR TO FIRST SCORING

1. Administer tests at schools.

2. Have schools organize the papers by teacher, if they want the papers returned to the school in that order (e.g., rubber band with the teacher's name/#, etc.).

3. Pick up tests on Friday afternoon (preferable) or Monday morning.

4. Stamp a sequential number (identical) on the cover of each Constructed Response (CR) booklet and top page of essay.

   * Determine how many CR booklets to expect, based upon latest student membership.
   * Determine which numbers to use for each school, alternating schools every several hundred numbers.
   * If the CR booklet is blank, look for a prewriting booklet. Staple the prewriting booklet onto the CR booklet; take the prewriting cover page and staple it with the CR booklet cover page.

5. Pull sample of papers for use as training papers and/or calibrating papers.

6. Make copies of training/calibration papers for use by scorers. Use colored paper for copies, so these cannot be mixed up with "real" papers. If needed, replace sample papers with others needing to be scored.

7. Keep list of teacher/school by sequence number stamped on essay/cover page.

8. Determine the number of packets needed, based on the number of CR booklets stamped.

9. Number the large envelopes that will be used for the packets.

10. Make copies of the Constructed Response Scoring Summary (CRSS) sheet, and write the packet number on them.

11. Divide the stamped booklets into an appropriate number of stacks for that school.

12. Determine how many CR booklets from each school should be in each packet. (For 1988-89: CCHS=6, OHS=4 or 5, and SHHS=4 or 5)

13. Using half of the CR booklets, create groups of 15 CR booklets, with the correct number from each school, criss-crossing them in piles.

14. For each group of 15 CR booklets:

    * Take a marked packet envelope and the corresponding marked CRSS sheet, and write the sequential numbers of the CR booklets for that packet on the CRSS sheet.

    * Carefully tear off the CR cover page from each booklet and clip them together, placing the CRSS sheet on top of them.

    * Place two yellow Post-It Notes on the top page of each essay, keeping the essays in numerical order (low number on top).

    * Insert the group of essays in the envelope and close the envelope.

    * Put the completed packets in numerical order.

FIRST SCORING

15. Give the scorers directions on how to record the scores.

    * Record the topic of the essay on the Post-It Note affixed to each paper, using a letter designation, with 1=A, 2=B, and 3=C, OT=Off Topic.

    * Record the score on the Post-It Note, using the scoring criteria (1-9).

    * Record whole numbers only (no X.5 scores).

    * Keep the papers in sequential number order (low # on top), placing scored papers face down.

    * If a blank test is found, pull it out so the Rough Draft can be located and scored.

* Note any papers which contain unusual topics or features, which may need follow-up by school staff (e.g., social service issues, suicide, abuse).

* Only work on one packet at a time.

* After completing a packet, the scorer must take a break.

* The time allotment for scoring each packet is 45 minutes.

16. After the training in the scoring criteria/rubric is completed, give each scorer their first assigned packet.

17. While scorers are scoring the first packet, create the second half of the packets, numbering the make-ups sequentially by school, using the proper sequence numbers for that school.

18. Create an area for unscored packets, with a space for each scorer. Scored packets should be placed in a **COMPLETED** box.

AFTER FIRST SCORING

19. Place the completed packets in numerical order. Take a packet and locate the corresponding packet of CRSS sheet/cover pages.

20. Remove the top Post-It Note from the essay and place it on the corresponding CR cover page, placing it on the left half of the CR cover page.

21. Record the essay score and topic number on the CRSS sheet for that essay number.

22. Place the essays back in the packet envelope.

23. Place the packet into the **READY FOR SECOND SCORING** box.

AFTER PACKETS ARE READY FOR SCORING

24. Deliver packets for scoring only a few minutes prior to the designated time for scoring those numbered packets.

AFTER SECOND SCORING

25. Place the completed packets in numerical order. Take a packet and locate the corresponding packet of CRSS sheet/cover pages.

26. Remove the Post-It Note from the essay and place it on the corresponding CR cover page, placing it on the right half of the cover page.

27. If the two scores (1-9) are the same or the discrepancy between the scores is two or less, the essay does not need to be scored again.

28. If the two scores differ by three or more (e.g., 7-4 or 2-5), or one score is passing (a score a 2 or more) and the other score is not a passing score (1 or 0), the essay must be scored a third time.

29. If one scorer determined the essay was off topic (OT) and the other scorer assigned a letter (ABC) to the topic, the essay must be rescored a third time.

IF NO THIRD READING IS NEEDED

30. Take CR cover pages and essays and rubber band them together; then place in a **FINISHED** box.

31. If all essays in a packet are completed, take the packet envelope and place it in a **FINISHED** stack, in numerical order.

32. If all essays in a packet finished with the scoring process, take the CRSS sheet and place it in a **FINISHED** stack, in packet number order.

IF A THIRD READING IS NEEDED

33. Place a Post-It Note on the essay. Place the essay back in the packet envelope. Paper clip the CR cover page for that essay and CRSS sheet for that packet to the envelope. Place the packet envelope into the **THIRD READING NEEDED** box. Take the CR cover pages and essays which do not need to be rescored, rubber band them together, and place them in a **FINISHED** box.

34. When there are 15 essays which need to be scored a third time, create a packet of 15 for scoring, using one of the empty packet envelopes.

    * Note which readers have already scored the essay which needs to be scored a third time. The third scorer must not have previously read the essay.

    * Clip together all the CR cover pages and the CRSS sheets for the packets involved in this newly created packet. Place packet envelopes not used for this third scoring packet in the **FINISHED** stack.

AFTER SCORING IS COMPLETED

35. Staple CR cover page to essay.

36. Write scores and topic information onto CR cover page, from Post-It Notes: Topic (convert from A-C to 1-4)
Score #1
Score #2
Pass-Fail (convert from 0-9 to 0-1)

(Convert Topics A-C to 1-4; for Pass-Fail score convert 0-9 to 0-1.)

37. Discard Post-It Notes from CR cover page.

38. Band in groups of 12 for entry into computer.

39. Enter scores into computer, making sure that **ENTERED** essays are kept separate from essays needing to be entered.

40. Run listing of constructed responses. Proof for Pass/Fail errors, and for Off-Topic and 0/1 split scores which need rescoring.

41. Sort CR booklets into numerical order.

42. Verify that all three-point discrepancies received a third scoring, by reviewing scores on the CR booklets or checking the scores on the CRSS sheets, after you get student number.

43. Select, find, and copy tests for scoring examples (essays which received two identical scores which accurately represented that score).

44. Find and copy tests which contain features needing follow-up by school staff. Mail to schools or give to head of psychological services.

45. Re-band CR booklets by Teacher/School for return.

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS

Office of Research and Evaluation

ATTACHMENT 4

Information for LA10 Scorers
1988-89

* Record the topic of the essay on the Post-It Note affixed to each paper, using a letter designation, with 1=A, 2=B, and 3=C, OT=Off Topic.

* Record the score on the Post-It Note, using the scoring criteria (1-9).

* Record one whole number only (no X.5 scores or X/X scores).

* Keep the papers in sequential number order (low # on top), placing scored papers face down.

* If a blank test is found, pull is out so the Rough Draft can be located and scored.

* Only work on one packet at a time (15 papers).

* The time allotment for scoring each packet is 45 minutes.

* After completing a packet, the scorer must take a break (5 or 10 minutes).

* The scoring schedule is:

  Wednesday:
  Morning--Training and 1 Packet
  Afternoon--3 Packets

  Thursday:
  Morning--4 Packets
  Afternoon--Recalibration and 3 Packets

  Friday:
  Morning--4 Packets
  Afternoon--3 Packets

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS
Office of Research and Evaluation

LA10 Scorer Averages

Session #	1	2	R	1	2	R	1	2	R	1	2	R	1	2	R
1															
2															
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															

(LA10Avg 6/88)

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS
Office of Research and Evaluation

Summary of LA10 Scorers
(Average score and number of rescores)

Session #	avg 1	avg 2	# res 1	# res 2	avg 1	avg 2	# res 1	# res 2	avg 1	avg 2	# res 1	# res 2	avg 1	avg 2	# res 1	# res 2
1																
2																
3																
4																
5																
6																
7																
8																
9																
10																
11																
12																
13																
14																
15																
16																
17																
18																

(LA10Summ 6/88)

ATTACHMENT 5

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS
Office of Research and Evaluation

Grade 10 Language Arts Constructed Response Scoring Schedule
April 19 - 21, 1989

	Wednesday				Thursday						Friday							
	a.m.		p.m.		a.m.				p.m.			a.m.			p.m.			
A	15	1	29	20	43	6	34	57	48	71	62	76	85	99	90	113	104	
B	16	2	30	22	44	8	36	58	50	72	64	78	86	100	92	114	101	
C	17	3	31	24	45	10	38	59	51	73	66	80	87	101	94	115	108	
D	18	4	32	25	46	11	39	60	53	74	67	81	88	102	95	116	109	
E	19	5	33	27	47	13	41	61	55	75	69	83	89	103	97	117	111	
F	20	6	34	28	48	14	42	62	56	76	70	84	90	104	98	118	112	
G	21	7	35	17	49	3	31	63	45	77	59	73	91	105	87	101	115	
H	22	8	19	36	5	50	64	33	78	47	61	92	75	87	106	103	102	
I	23	9	26	37	12	51	65	40	79	54	68	93	82	96	107	110	[redacted]	
J	24	10	23	38	9	52	66	37	80	51	65	94	79	93	108	107	[redacted]	
K	25	11	16	39	2	53	67	30	81	44	58	95	72	86	109	100	114	
L	26	12	18	40	4	54	68	32	82	46	60	96	74	88	110	102	116	
M	27	13	21	41	7	55	69	35	83	49	63	97	77	91	111	105		
N	—	—	—	—	(13)	(19)	(1)	(6)	(12)	(29)		(43)	(53)	(58)	(71)	(62)	(52)	
O	28	14	15	42	1	56	70	29	84	43	57	98	71	85	112	99	113	

ATTACHMENT 6

CHERRY CREEK SCHOOLS
Office of Research and Evaluation

Grade 10 Language Arts Assessment

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE SCORING SUMMARY

Packet Number 74 Scorer 1 D Scorer 2 L

Paper	Sequence Number	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Comments
1	8	C 7	C 7		
2	154	B 5	B 6		
3	219	B 4	B 4		
4	325	C 4	C 4		
5	391	C 6	C 5		
6	523	OT 3	B 2	B 4	
7	816	A 4	A 4		✓
8	847	OT 2	OT 2		
9	1080	C 5	C 5		
10	1108	C 4	C 5		
11	1386	C 5	C 5		
12	1496	OT 4	B 7	OT 4	
13	1505	C 5	C 6		
14	1819	C 4	C 5		
15	1883	C 2	C 2		✓
AVG				2	

Testing Date: April 1989